

From: drupal_admin <drupal_admin@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 7:03 PM
To: HarborComments
Subject: Harbor Comments

Submitted on 09/06/2016 9:02PM

Submitted values are:

Your Name: (b) (6)

Your Email (b) (6)

Your Comments:

Generally it looks reasonable, combining elements of key things that should occur for a cleanup. It also fits well into how EPA has been handling mega-sites in other parts of the country.

The remaining concerns are the toxic materials that don't get cleaned up this time round. You guys know you'll be leaving a fair amount of stuff in the river sediments. Proposal Alternative H is way beyond what you are capable of, but it may be closer to what eventually needs to happen to bring this river back in a big way. You know this and many of us in the community know it. Even Alternative G is a step up from Alternative I, as many in the community are suggesting.

Based on my prior experience with EPA and its Superfund Program, I am understanding of the ways in which you guys are hampered. It must be frustrating having the intense political pressures you have coming from multiple directions. So my comments tend to be light. Ultimately, there is no way of getting around that this choice is less than what it should have been -- less expensive, less thorough. But, in the context of other cleanups, it is reasonable.

Thanks.